

**Agenda and Evaluation Report
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Psychology Majors and Minors, 2022-2023**

Date: 2/17/2023

Time: 1:00-2:00

Place: LT 4120

Invited: Interim Provost Robin Fox; Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Elizabeth Olson; faculty and staff in the Psychology program Elizabeth Olson, Barbara Beaver, Kimberly Knesting-Lund, Meg Waraczynski, Dan Stadler; Audit & Review Team Chair Pascal Letourneau, Audit & Review team members Leda Kanellakou; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

- 1) Call to order
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
 - a) The psychology program asked to clarify that the last A&R was in 2012, and not 2017. The program questioned the team's second recommended action related to assessment and made a strong case supporting the program's current plan. They were encouraged to focus and organize the plan according to student learning outcomes.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) Discuss staffing in the program and any thoughts you have related to attracting and retaining faculty.
 - i) The program has made an offer and is hopeful to have a tenure position filled starting fall 2023.
 - ii) Current faculty turnover was tied to personal and family/life reasons and not necessarily due to elements in control of the program. It is possible some of the realities of the institution, such as teaching load and salaries, impact the number of applicants.
 - iii) The program also described conditions in the field that may be impacting student recruitment.
 - b) What is the rationale for choosing not to seek guidance from an advisory board?
 - i) There was recognition of difficulty identifying who would serve on an advisory board since the field is so diverse. Past make up of advisory board was not necessarily helpful for program purposes. At this point, the program feels they need more time to determine topics from advisory stakeholders.
 - ii) Discussion ensued regarding other ways the program could engage stakeholder using methods they may not see as a "traditional" advisory board.
 - iii) Considering student focused advisory meetings
 - c) Dean interjected his thoughts on how his advisory board supported the work of Letters and Sciences.
 - d) The program led a good discussion regarding reflection on DFW rates. The program described numerous strategies they implement to support students and have made significant gains with student who seek out faculty support.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended action (see page 12, point 4) related to retention, assessment, and placement rates.
- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation with minor concerns*
- Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).
 - Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year:
 - Next FULL self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1, 2027 and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2027.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2022-2023**

Date of Evaluation 12/6/2022 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: Psychology Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: SA Welch; Karl Brown; Pascal Letourneau; Katy Casey; Leda Kanellakou
Review meeting attended by: Karl Brown; Pascal Letourneau; Katy Casey; Leda Kanellakou

I. General Program Information

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 2 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 3 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| First self-study for the program | 0 |

3. Characteristics of the program set it apart from others when compared regionally and nationally. The unique aspects of the program attract students.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 3 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 2 |

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Reports; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 2 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 3 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |
| First self-study for the program | 0 |

5. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate (only select N/A if there is no accreditation available).

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

N/A

5

General Comments related to Section I

1. Partial evidence selected because I did not read anything that described what was involved in a psychology degree-- the term psychology was used to describe psychology as opposed to defining that for this program.
4. I'm concerned about jettisoning the advisory board entirely -- do these new measures adequately replace it?
- 3: The major and minor offer wonderful opportunities and so on, but it was unclear how these characteristics make them unique from other programs regionally and nationally. 4: While they dismantled their advisory board, they have found new avenues for community feedback via their connections with the various old and new field sites.
- Q1: I would have liked to see a clearer connection to University mission statement. Q2: not sure what this is (but there was a brief description): "increase in verticality in the major" Q4: this was their reply for 1st recommendation: "The Department has not chosen to continue with an advisory board, partly due to the diversity of faculty expertise and student post-graduate experiences" (now, the last review was 2017 and a whole lot of changes happened between then & now. I'm curious: when did they decide to not use an advisory board? (shortly after the 2017 review? or later?)

II. Alignment within the University**1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Mission and Strategic Plan.**

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. The program is collaborative and supports other academic programs across the College and/or University.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section II

2. Significant contributions to supporting the general education curriculum.

Q1 & 2: they wrote this: " We will seek opportunities to build new partnerships with community, business, and governmental organizations in support of our mission." but.....have decided to not follow the suggestion of forming an advisory board? Perhaps a good place to ease into this would be to consult with those who have provided the 5 endowed scholarships (mentioned earlier in the report).

I wonder why there is no comment under Goal #4. When looking at how the program contributes to GenEd, why is 2021 data missing?

1. excellent. 2. excellent, for both CORE and other gen ed requirements
- 2: This department has impressive contributions to the CORE, in particular CORE 130 and which go beyond just teaching. 3: Please provide more specifics, rather than referring to other documents. Thanks.

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. Goals currently in place will contribute to the program's advancement. Criteria for determining success were measurable and attainable.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 2 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 3 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals and making decision about changes to the program.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section III

2. I'd like to know more about the criteria that will be used to assess curricular reform

2: Please provide examples of how new assessment will be measure curriculum's "verticality and challenge," and how well it supports marginalized students. Also, more specific information around areas the two new TT faculty will specialize in, and how that aligns with goals of the department. 3: Besides some lapse during COVID early years, the department has assessment in mind and a process to keep it moving.

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. The program prepares students in majors, minors, and related emphases tracks in post-graduation and other applicable experiences.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 4 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 1 |

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 3 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 1 |

4. Students participate in the high impact practices.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section IV

There was no evidence that current assessment data was used to inform curricular changes.

2. I like the 3 different minor options. 4. An impressive range of HIPs are apparent here.

1: Removing emphasis majors due to low enrollment, and other changes, are reflective of the department's attention to what is working, and what is not. 2: The answer does tell about the major's ability to prepare its students for post-graduation experiences, but neglects to explain "how." 4: There are a lot of writing intensive assignments and creative projects which include critical thinking, analyses of current issues, creative research work, and field work. The learning community and student org also play a strong role in the program. I was surprised to see no field trips, or guest speakers or other means of high impact practices.

"Reviewing of data most regularly happens as part of the fall Department retreat, and continuing discussions occur as-needed throughout the academic year." What specific data? How is this data interpreted? and how does the data guide curricular changes in the program? Q4: very nice! This information was very thorough and helpful! Thank you!

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has clearly articulated learning outcomes for students.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 5 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. Student learning outcomes are "mapped" to the curriculum.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. The program provided a timeline indicating when faculty and staff assess SLOs. The timeline is manageable and sustainable.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 4 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 1 |

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgements about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 4 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 1 |

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 2 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 3 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

6. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

7. Overall, the program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 0 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 4 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 1 |

General Comments related to Section V

Significant time has been spent on SLO development data was provided on student learning but with little context, and it was difficult to align the results to the outcomes.

Q5 what specific data is being assessed and how are action related to this specific data being implemented? Q5: saw this: "Assessment data obtained in the department's participation in the 2011-2013 DQP process revealed that both students and faculty expressed a desire for increased verticality in the major." A couple of questions: A) verticality is now mentioned twice in this report, but am still unsure what it is. B) this report (DQP) is from BEFORE the LAST review. So, what is being assessed & acted upon for this POST 2017 review?

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 3 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. [MAJORS ONLY] As a follow up to program enrollment and graduation, describe the strategies used to recruit and retain students.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

4. Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

5. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

6. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to Section VI.A

3. This is pretty impressive, and more than most departments do in this regard. 5. I like that they've identified and are compensating for the bottleneck at PSYCH 215/216
-
- 2: Number of credits to degree are within the lows and highs for the College of L&S. Advisors also helping with students getting started on the difficult statistics requirement. 3: Many great ideas to help with recruitment listed.

VI. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 3 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 1 |

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments for VI.B

100% reported to CLD is not the same as a 100% placement overall -- is any better data available?

1: Please include the response rate of students for the Career & Leadership Development survey, and in relation to your department graduation numbers. What is reported on job placement is incomplete, and may be misleading. The department does however have great success with graduate school paths.

Q2: it was very helpful that specific sources (Bureau of Labor Statistics for example) were used for this question.

VII. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Information on numbers of full and part-time faculty and staff are provided. Expertise of teaching staff are aligned with the needs and future vision for the program.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. Information is provided about changes in the faculty since the last Audit and Review.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments related to section VII.A

1: Clear statement of needs, and plans for recruitment.

It is quite commendable that the program acknowledges the struggle that its faculty has with: 4/4 load, the effect of the pandemic, and work/life balance.

3. The program identifies potential future needs, recruiting and retention potential problems, but offer little in terms of what could be done to mitigate the recruiting and retention problems.

VII. Resource Availability & Development: B. Student Resources

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. The program has adequate facilities equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 4 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 1 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments for VII.B

1. As noted, the program needs 2 new hires. 2. Overall yes, but Winther is in dire need of renovation.

1: The department is stretching faculty to serve students, something that will be addressed soon with two new hires, assuming they are successful.

YES, the program addressed both of these questions thoroughly. But, the questions asked about "adequate" sources, and as their report notes: they are struggling with significant issues.

There might be opportunities in the community, with business partners, to get laptops donated or lent.

VIII. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Sufficient Evidence | 5 |
| Some/Partial Evidence | 0 |
| No/Limited Evidence | 0 |

General Comments for VIII

None

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

This is a robust program. Changes made since the last A&R, most notably the increased verticality and curriculum reform, are positive. URM representation, and the attention paid to this important segment of our student body, is unique.

The program is robust with enrollment, informed by assessment, and department members are aware of needed changes. Faculty are amazing, dedicated, and engaged with students at many levels of the program. The student organization is strong, field study work, and collaborative writing projects in courses help students meet many ELOs and major SLOs.

1. The program seems to have a clear understanding of the challenges it has faced since the pandemic. 2. Their discussion of diversity of their students was very good.

The program has many students, yet the placement is 100%.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

Get Winther fixed, and provide the necessary technology.

COVID delayed some assessment, and two faculty also left recently. The department has been approved to hire two more faculty members, and assessment is getting back on track. Students are having difficulty with their required PSYCH 215 course. The department needs to identify the factor(s) there and make improvements for success. Some may have not been included in the report, but the major/minors could use more diversity in the opportunities for high impact practices in the classroom. While lots of writing assignments (research, analyses, creative methodology work) and group work (incl presentations), plus student org, field work and the learning community are commendable and included, there was little diversity within classrooms mentioned (such as field trips, guest speakers, in-class activities/thinking exercises, study abroad relationships, travel studies, community service, etc.).

There were some areas (specific assessment actions) that the program was complimented on in the 2017 review that seem to have become lax in recent years.

The program needs to work hard to recruit and retain good faculty that will contribute to teaching, research and service, despite the obstacles.

3. Other comments/questions

1. Is retention a problem? I can't tell if it's any better or worse than any other program, given the size of the dept-- but it seems a little high, especially for junior faculty. Are exit interviews or some other means of assessing why faculty leave a possibility? 2. from p5: "Department data for graduates was not collected during pandemic years, and data collection outside of pandemic years is not yet systematic or formalized" -- are there any plans to do so?

The department is excellent and is a great example to others. The report was well done, and they seem to have high awareness of their program strengths and some weaknesses. They are an asset to the College and University, including their contributions to the CORE.

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1. Investigate and provide new ideas to reduce the issues related to high DFW rates, especially in Psych 215, which may impact student retention and success in the program.
2. Clearly describe the assessment process and how it supports the program's understanding of students learning as opposed to program goals: 1) select a reasonable set of SLOs (5-8), consistent with the language on your program website, and that are evaluated on a regular basis; 2) clearly and consistently report on student learning outcomes; and 3) separate out the student learning and program assessment.
3. There seemed to be little evidence on placement information. The data provided by Career and Leadership Development is limited, and does not fully describe the success of the students who complete your program. Create at least one initiative related to tracking graduate success before the next self-study.

5. Recommended Result

| | |
|--|---|
| Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit. | 0 |
| Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report. | 0 |
| Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team. | 5 |
| Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns | 0 |
| Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion. | 0 |
| Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion. | 0 |
| Non-continuation of the program. | 0 |
| Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action. | 0 |